SUBJECTS.

Dewan.—Supposing that no kist month could be adopted for Mithunom, would you prefer the existing state of affairs by which half the kist is paid in Medom and the other half in Edavom, or would you pay the whole amount in one month, *viz.*, Edavom?

Member.—In that case, we would rather pay the whole kist in Edavom.

Dewan's reply.—It will not be convenient, for purposes of collection, to have any kist after Edavom. The proposal to adopt a Mithunom kist cannot therefore be accepted. His Highness' Government recognise that, as puncha crops are generally harvested early in Medom, it would probably be to the convenience of the ryots if Medom *is not* a kist month. Probably, the best thing would be to have only *one* kist for the puncha lands and that in Edavom. A change, however, like that could not be made except after a very careful enquiry. The Peishkars will be asked to consult the leading ryots holding puncha lands and ascertain if they would prefer to have a single kist in Edavom or continue to have two kists as now, in Medom and Edavom.

Desirability of registering the bunds of paddy fields &c. and the trees standing thereon permanently in the names of the owners of the adjoining lands.

Mr. A. Narayanan Unnithan (Member, Kottarakara Taluk) said that the practice now was to record all bunds of paddy fields as poramboke and to lease them out on kuthagapattom to the owners of adjoining lands or to any others who applied for them. Such bunds were intended merely for the protection of the adjoining lands. The owners of those lands generally kept them in good condition, spending much money and labour on them and planting trees on such bunds and they had from a long time been in enjoyment of them. At the settlement, the bunds were generally included under the head of 'poramboke' and the applications of the occupants for registering them in their names were being refused on the ground that they were poramboke. He therefore requested that, as in the case of other Sirkar lands, such bunds should also be permanently registered in the names of the owners of the neighbouring lands.

Mr. M. Sivathanu Pillai (Member, Tovala Taluk) requested that the trees standing on poramboke lands, such as field bunds &c., should be registered in the names of the growers at a reduced rate of pattom. Such trees were at present being leased on kuthagapattom without any limit of time under the Rules dated 27th Karkadagom 1074. The rules did not provide for any uniform rate of pattom, which latter was therefore being fixed arbitrarily by the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

lower subordinates of the Revenue department at rates considerably higher than the settlement pattom. In these cases, it was desirable that the pattom fixed should not exceed the assessment that would be put upon the trees at the settlement. He suggested, therefore, that the trees standing on poramboke lands be ordered to be registered in the names of the growers at a uniform rate of 2 chs. per tree.

Dewan's reply.—There are several questions raised. In regard to the field bunds, the survey and settlement having been already completed, we cannot now alter the classification retrospectively by any general order. At the same time, I would point out to you that, under the standing orders, it is competent to the Peishkar, should he consider that any land has been classified as poramboke but that it is not needed for any public purpose, to obtain sanction to transfer it to the head of assessed waste and register it in the name of the occupant. I would therefore advise you to bring individual cases to the notice of the Revenue department and thus obtain the necessary redress. In the case of porambokes whose assignment is not considered desirable, it is competent to the Revenue department to register on kuthagapattom the trees standing on those lands. This also is a matter for the Revenue department.

As regards the rates of pattom, that again is a matter for the Peishkars and Tahsildars, and I do not think that any useful purpose would be served by my issuing any general order. I would ask you to meet the Peishkar and explain to him the matters in which you seek redress. Should the Peishkar think that the rules now in force require revision in any respect, it is open to him to submit proposals for revising them.

Suggestions for reducing the growing poverty of the people on account of the steady rise in the price of paddy.

Mr. K. Raman Unnithan (Member, Kunnattur Taluk) said that, as compared with the condition of the country till 1082, a growing poverty was now noticeable among the people generally, the chief causes being the decline in agriculture and the wholesale prevention of hill cultivation. With a view to improve the present condition, he made the following suggestions for the consideration of Government:—

(1) Cultivation should be allowed in unobjectionable places within reserves, as laid down in G. O. No. 3142, dated 1st July 1907.

(2) Malavaram cultivation should also be permitted

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly